UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/576,108	07/17/2006	Oddvin Reiso	2006_0560A	1717	
	7590 10/21/201 , LIND & PONACK, I	EXAMINER			
1030 15th Stree		YANG, JIE			
Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1733		
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			10/21/2010	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com eoa@wenderoth.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/576,108	REISO ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JIE YANG	1733		

	JIE YANG	1733	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 October 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	t, or other evidence, www. with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	001100
<ul> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet</li> </ul>	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ul>		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:</li> </ol>		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
<ul> <li>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/ Roy King/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1733	/Jie Yang/		

There is no amendment in the instant claims. Claims 5, 7, and 8 remain for examination.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance:

The Applicant's arguments filed on 10/4/2010 with respect to claims 5, 7, and 8 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments are summarized as follows:

- 1, the Examiner uses a mosaic when arguing against the composition as defined in claim 5 of the present application. Mg and Mn do not present in the Fig. of US'359 together.
- 2, The Examiner has apparently misunderstood the content of Fig.10-13 for showing the range of Mn between 0.03wt% to 0.06wt% because only two samples of Mn namely 0.09wt% and 0.03wt% is present in Fig.10-13.

  In response

The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant's agurments. Regarding the argument 1, all the samples for the Fig. 2-4, 6, and 14 and Fig. 10-13 of US'359 are AlMgSi alloy of the AA6000 series (Co.1, line 5 to Col.2, line 47 of US'359). It is not necessary to list all of the other elements to study one specific element's effect on the property of the alloy. Regarding the argument 2, The Examiner notes that Fig. 13 of US'359 clearly teaches Mn range from 0-0.09wt%, which covers the range 0.03 to 0.06wt%Mn.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jie Yang whose telephone number is 571-2701884. The examiner can normally be reached on IFP.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on 571-2721244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.